Comment on "Macroscopic Test of the Aharonov-Bohm Effect"

Tomislav Ivezić
Ruđer Bošković Institute, P.O.B. 180, 10002 Zagreb, Croatia
ivezic@irb.hr

arXiv:1407.4826v1 [quant-ph] 4 Jun 2014

In [1] the absence of forces for the magnetic Aharonov-Bohm (AB) effect [2] has been experimentally investigated by means of a time-of-flight experiment for a macroscopic solenoid. It is looked for a time delay for electrons passing on opposite sides of the solenoid. In the generally accepted theory the AB effect is considered to be a purely quantum mechanical in nature. The electron wave packets are influenced by nonzero vector potential, i.e., by the quantum action of the magnetic flux, even when electrons pass through the field-free regions of space, Eq. (1) and Fig. 1(a) in [1]. On the other hand in Boyer's semiclassical theory, Ref. [16] in [1], there is a back-action force of the solenoid on the electron, which gives rise to a time delay, Eq. (4) in [1], and to a phase shift, Eq. (8) in [1], that exactly matches the AB-phase shift. As shown in [1] "no time delay is observed (Fig. 3), thus signaling the absence of forces." But, in [3], Boyer stated: "the Aharonov-Bohm phase shift has never been observed for such a macroscopic solenoid, .. ." In [3], it is also argued that if the solenoid resistance is large, as in [1], then the back forces will be small and there is no time lag, but for the microscopic solenoids it is the opposite case.

However, as explained in Sec. 10 in [4], in the experiments from [1] and Ref. [6] in [1], in all theoretical discussions including [2] and Boyer's semiclassical theory, it is *never* noticed that *always* there is an electric field outside stationary resistive conductor carrying constant current. In such ohmic conductor there are quasistatic surface charges that generate not only the electric field inside the wire driving the current, *but also a static electric field outside it*, which has nothing to do with Boyer's force picture. There are no analytic solutions for these surface charges and the external electric fields for the case of finite solenoids; for an infinite solenoid see [5]. For the hystorical analysis and for some experimental confirmation see Ref. [42] in [4]. The distribution of the surface charges and the magnitude of the induced electric fields depend not only on the geometry of the circuit but even of its surroundings. These fields are well-known in electrical engineering, which means that they can be much bigger than those in Boyer's picture. Hence, the main result from [1] does not imply that the electrons travel in a field-free region. These fields have to be taken into account for the explanation of the AB phase difference even in the magnetic AB effect. A similar explanation is already proposed in [6], Eq. (28), but their calculation is not relativistically correct. In Secs. 7-7.2 in [4] it is shown that even if the experiments would be made with superconducting solenoids with steady currents there would be the external electric field. In Sec. 8 in [4] such electric fields are predicted to exist for a *stationary* permanent magnet as well. Note that in [1] the whole treatment is with the 3D quantities. In the recent paper [7] the covariant expression for the AB phase difference $\delta\alpha_{EB}$ in terms of the Faraday 2-form F is presented, $\delta\alpha_{EB} = (e/\hbar)\int F$, where $F = (-1/2)F_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu$, $F_{\mu\nu} = (v_\mu E_\nu - v_\nu E_\mu) + \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}v^\alpha B^\beta$, E_μ and B_μ are the components of the 4D electric and magnetic fields respectively, v_μ are the components of the 4D velocity of a family of observers who measure electric and magnetic fields, see also [4]. If the observers are at rest in the rest frame of the solenoid $v^\mu = (1,0,0,0)$, $E_0 = B_0 = 0$ and the electric part $\delta\alpha_E$ of $\delta\alpha_{EB}$ is $\delta\alpha_E = (e/\hbar)\int v_0 E_i(x)dx^i \wedge dx^0$. There, in [7], it is also argued that in the 4D spacetime only $\delta\alpha_E$ is physically correct and justified in the magnetic AB effect, because only the electric field from the solenoid with steady current exists in the region outside the solenoid and it can *locally* influence the electron travelling through that region. In order to clarify the situation some new experiments are required: the measurement in a *single* experiment of the AB phase shift and the time delay, as suggested in [3], and the measurement of the mentioned external electric fields *separately* from AB-studies.

References

[1] A. Caprez, B. Barwick and H. Batelaan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 210401 (2007).
[2] Y. Aharonov and D. Bohm, Phys. Rev. **115**, 485 (1959).
[3] T. H. Boyer, Found. Phys. **38**, 498 (2008).
[4] T. Ivezić, J. Phys.: Conf. Ser. **437**, 012014 (2013); arxiv 1204.5137.
[5] M. A. Heald, Am. J. Phys. **52**, 522 (1984).
[6] H. Torres S., A. K. T. Assis, Revista de la Facultad de Ingenieria de la Universidad de Tarapaca (Chile) **9**, 29 (2001).
[7] T. Ivezić, submitted to Phys. Lett. B.